

A SEMI-CLASSICAL APPROACH TO GRAVITATION, MASS AND SPIN.

MARTIN TAMM

ABSTRACT. A simple geometric four-dimensional theory is discussed in which gravitation, mass, spin, energy conservation and other related concepts can be viewed as consequences of a certain weak quantum principle.

1. INTRODUCTION.

The purpose of this paper is to try to understand the origin of gravitation, mass and spin and also the relations between these concepts. By necessity, any such attempt must involve both the general theory of relativity and quantum theory, and in fact, most efforts so far have been using the framework of quantum mechanics. However since quantum mechanics, miraculously efficient as it may be, can hardly be claimed to be well understood itself, we will here choose another approach. Hence, we will not assume the full machinery of contemporary quantum physics but only one seemingly inevitable basic principle from it. It will then be seen that this assumption, when taken as a foundation, will more or less imply a macroscopic theory which, at least for small curvature, coincides with classical General Relativity. The model to be used is strictly four-dimensional and particles are simply viewed as topological obstructions to ordinary Euclidian geometry. It will be argued that, in contrast to what happens in pure relativity theory, such particles tend to be stable and can be equipped with a natural definition of mass. Moreover, this definition suggests a natural spin property of such particles; it seems to be a curious consequence of the Lorentz geometry that rotating particles may have lower mass than non-rotation ones, hence offering a possibility to explain non-zero spin states as natural groundstates.

This starting point is, of course, in many respects much more naive than what is commonly used in most current theories, i.e. various gauge and string theories, and it is not claimed that the simple model that we suggest can be used to explain all properties that one would like. Rather, the idea is to set up a simple enough framework for the mysterious concept of mass to become understandable.

Moreover, it has been the explicit ambition of the author to avoid ad hoc assumptions of all kinds as far as possible. This obviously restricts our possibilities to include large areas of current physics, in the same time as it gives no guarantee that the concepts we are led to will give a relevant description of reality.

Finally, It should be noted that many of the arguments presented are heuristic. In fact, a rigorous treatment of this subject would probably have to make use of mathematical technology on quite another level. The author can only hope that these notes will help to attract the attention of others to the possibilities that this approach might give.

2. THE BASIC POSTULATES

The attempt to unite general relativity and quantum mechanics is a central theme in contemporary physics. However, although equally important for our understanding of the Universe, these two theories differ fundamentally by the way they were discovered. General relativity can be said to rest on just one extremely natural idea, namely the equivalence of all frames of reference. Although general relativity is a macroscopic theory, we shall assume this to hold true also on the microlevel. This leads to the following

Postulate 1 (Relativity Principle.). space-time is described by a manifold which is locally lorentzian, i.e. at every point the geometry is given by locally equivalent Lorentz frames.

The history of quantum physics on the other hand, is a long list of odd solutions to various counterintuitive problems, which were all in the end united into the wonderful theory of quantum mechanics. If we take a closer look into the history of physics, there appear to have been mainly four types of phenomena that were involved in the invention of quantum mechanics: First, certain variables that were classically believed to behave continuously turned out to be discrete. Secondly, the microscopic world seemed to behave in a nondeterministic way in certain situations. Thirdly, it was realized that not all dynamic variables of a particle could simultaneously be given a precise meaning. Finally, in some cases it seemed as if a particle could simultaneously develop in different ways and hence many different histories of the same particle had to be taken into account in order to get a full description of an event.

In this paper, we shall take the point of view that it is the last type of phenomena, which is most fundamental to Quantum Mechanics. In fact, from the point of view of present day mathematics, it appears almost strange that phenomena of type one or two caused so much anguish in the beginning of the last century. On the other hand, it can be argued that phenomena of type three could partly be the result of our ability, based on macroscopic experience, to ask the wrong kind of questions for elementary particles.

This leads to the following

Postulate 2 (Weak Quantum Principle.). In order to describe the physics of a certain region in space-time, we must take into account all space-time manifolds that are compatible with the outer constraints.

Formulated in this way, the weak quantum principle is really more of a question than an answer. In fact, as long as we do not specify how the different space-time manifolds are to be taken into account, it is hard to see how the principle could be applied at all. Hence, any attempt to go further must necessarily contain a more precise statement. In this paper, we shall, using a well-known idea from statistical mechanics, treat all space-time geometries as an ensemble, thus attributing to each geometry a certain statistical weight.

It should be noted that we make no assumption at this stage about the way in which different manifolds interfere with each other, as a more complete theory clearly would have to do. This is part of the reason for the word "semi-classical" in the title.

In deciding how this ensemble should be constructed, we shall be guided by the following geometric idea, which is perhaps on the one hand, not obviously true,

but on the other hand originates in a very natural way from Einstein's theory of gravitation.

Postulate 3 (Local Geometric Principle.). The statistical weight of a certain space-time manifold depends only on its local geometric properties.

3. THE ENSEMBLE.

Of course, one can not expect it to be possible to deduce the form of the ensemble from the three postulates in a strict logical sense. Moreover, it is often supposed that the quantum fluctuations of the geometry will increase in magnitude as we consider smaller and smaller regions and finally, as we reach the Planck-scale, the concept of manifolds may not be relevant. However, if we in addition to the postulates assume a few simple things about the quantum fluctuations of the metrical structure, it is claimed that a natural candidate for the Ensemble will emerge.

Let us first note that it is a natural supposition to make from the relativity principle and the local geometric principle that the probability weight of a certain geometry should depend only of its scalar curvature since this is really the simplest local geometric invariant there is; it could very well be that more complicated invariants are involved, but even if so, it is natural to start by investigating the simplest situation and introduce more complicated assumptions only when they are called for. We also note that this type of argument is commonly used to motivate the Hilbert action principle which is a corner stone in the theory of general relativity [1]. Since it may be impossible to talk about curvature at all at an infinitesimal scale, we shall instead consider the average scalar curvature over regions with a given small volume.

Hence, consider a macroscopic region Ω in space-time, and suppose that we divide it into microscopic regions D_α , $\alpha \in I$, each with space-time volume $\approx \Delta$. If we now consider the total scalar curvature R_α in D_α , then it is reasonable to argue that R_α is the sum of contributions from fluctuations of the metric in much smaller regions, and that these fluctuations behave essentially as statistically independent variables. Hence, if we in addition assume that the expectation value is zero, a central limit type of argument shows that the probability amplitude for R_α should behave as

$$(1) \quad p_\alpha \propto \exp\{-\mu_\Delta R_\alpha^2\}.$$

Moreover, a simple statistical argument (using that the mean curvature in a region $D = \cup D_\alpha$ is the mean of the corresponding mean curvature in the D_α :s) gives that the constant μ_Δ should be of the form

$$(2) \quad \mu_\Delta = \Delta\mu.$$

If we accept this expression p_α for the statistical weight of the geometry within D_α then, in view of the local geometric principle, we are led to the following formula for the joint probability distribution in Ω ;

$$(3) \quad \exp\{-\mu_\Delta \sum_\alpha R_\alpha^2\}$$

which for small Δ can be written approximately as

$$(4) \quad \exp\{-\mu \int_\Omega R_\Delta^2 dV\}$$

where R_Δ denotes the average scalar curvature at the scale Δ and dV the four-dimensional volume element. Summing up, we have

Postulate 4 (Ensemble Postulate). Given a bounded region Ω in space-time and assuming that the probability distribution for the metric is specified on $\partial\Omega$, the weight of a certain space-time geometry, compatible with the metric on the boundary, is proportional to

$$\exp\{-\mu \int_{\Omega} R_{\Delta}^2 dV\}.$$

Remark 1. It will in the following be used that μ is extremely large. In fact, it is generally supposed that at the Planck scale ($\sim l_P = 10^{-35}\text{m}$), the metric fluctuations become so large that the trivial topological structure of space-time is no longer ensured. If we therefore take l_P as our unit of length, then it follows that the typical size of a fluctuation in R_Δ ($\Delta \approx 1$) is of the order ~ 1 and hence on this scale, $\mu \sim 1$. If we now pass to a region D of size typical to elementary particles (diameter $\sim 10^{-15}\text{m}$), we obtain using (2) that on this level, $\mu \sim \text{vol}(D) \sim 10^{80}$, an enormous number indeed.

Clearly, the above statement is not precise since it involves measuring in the space of all possible metrics. However, we do not want to involve too much infinite-dimensional measure theory. It may very well be that all this cumbersome mathematics would have little to do with physics. In fact, the ensemble measure is a purely statistical tool and it is beyond our knowledge what actually happens at the Planck scale; it could very well be something far simpler than what our mathematical abstractions would lead us to. In the following, we shall therefore simply work with some small but fixed Δ which we assume to be very small when compared to the size of the topological objects that we will study, but still large when compared to the Planck length. We shall also restrict ourselves to metrics that vary slowly at this scale, i.e. in each D_α . It is still not trivial to give a proper description of the corresponding measure. To minimize the technicalities, we shall proceed as follows: We can define the distance between two Minkowski metrics m_1, m_2 on $\mathbf{R}^4$ to be

$$(5) \quad d(m_1, m_2) = \inf_{L_1, L_2} \|L_1 - L_2\|$$

where L_1 and L_2 are Lorentz frames with respect to m_1 and m_2 and the norm refers to some natural measure of distance on the Stiefel manifold of 4-frames in $\mathbf{R}^4$.

Then given a metric g in Ω and a number δ such that $0 < \delta \ll \Delta$, we define a neighbourhood $U_{g,\delta}$ of g in G_Ω , the space of all smooth metrics on Ω , by

$$(6) \quad U_{g,\delta} = \{g' \in G_\Omega : d_x(g_x, g'_x) < \delta \text{ for all } x \in \Omega\}$$

where g_x and g'_x denote the induced metrics on the tangent space at the point x . We now assign (approximately) the same measure $\omega(U_{g,\delta})$ to all $U_{g,\delta}$ independently of g (δ fixed). Moreover, we shall assume that there is a positive measure dP_Ω which assigns (approximately) the value

$$(7) \quad \exp\{-\mu \int_{\Omega} R_{\Delta}^2 dV\} \omega(U_{g,\delta})$$

to $U_{g,\delta}$, and we shall write

$$(8) \quad dP_\Omega = \exp\{-\mu \int_{\Omega} R_{\Delta}^2 dV\} d\omega.$$

In the following sections, we shall simply take the existence of this measure for granted, and we shall also assume that the theory is more or less independent of the exact choice of Δ .

Remark 2. The detailed construction of this measure is not trivial to carry out, but a sketch of it could look as follows: First we note that it follows from formula (14) in section 5 that the first variation of R_Δ is given by the corresponding Ricci tensor. Hence, if we consider the subspace $G_\Omega^N \subset G_\Omega$ of all metrics with the trace-norm of their Ricci tensors bounded by N , then for δ sufficiently small, the curvature integral in (7) will have a fixed value on each $U_{g,\delta}$. Therefore, if we restrict our study to some fixed G_Ω^N , no great problem should arise in the definition of the corresponding measure dP_Ω^N .

On the other hand, if we want to get rid of the perhaps somewhat unnatural bound N , then we have to refer to section 5 where it is argued that large Ricci curvature makes the corresponding metric very unlikely. Thus, for large N the set $G_\Omega \setminus G_\Omega^N$ should have very small measure which makes it probable that the limit

$$(9) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} dP_\Omega^N = dP_\Omega$$

should exist as a measure on all of G_Ω .

We shall also assume the corresponding "partition function"

$$(10) \quad \Pi_\Omega = \int_{G_\Omega} dP_\Omega = \int_{G_\Omega} \exp\{-\mu \int_\Omega R_\Delta^2 dV\} d\omega$$

to be finite for bounded regions Ω . Again, this is a non-obvious but reasonable assumption; the exponential factor will tend to give all geometries with non-zero scalar curvature a very small measure.

There is also another very important remark to make about the ensemble which will become clearer later on. As is common in statistical mechanics, we shall assume that the state sum Π for a certain region Ω is dominated by one or at most a few metrics, or more precisely, by small perturbations to these metrics. A metric which dominates Π_Ω as above is expected to have strong regularity properties. Partly, the reason is obvious; if a possible singularity manifests itself through high scalar curvature, then clearly the exponential term in (4) will guarantee that it will play no important role in the partition function. On the other hand, manifolds with zero scalar curvature can be quite singular. However, it will be argued in section 6 that not only large scalar curvature but in fact also large Ricci tensor makes the corresponding metric improbable, hence setting much more severe conditions for the most probable metrics.

We shall think of such a regular g metric as a *macro-state* and associate with it an unnormalized probability

$$(11) \quad \Pi_g \approx \exp\{-\mu \int_{\Omega_g} R_g^2 dV\} \cdot \omega_g$$

where ω_g somehow measures the contributions of small variations of g and we have replaced R_Δ by the curvature R_g of the macro-metric, since in practice g will vary very slowly on the scale determined by Δ . ω_g plays a role which is slightly similar to "the density of states" used in statistical mechanics; the properties of the ensemble are determined by an interplay between the curvature integral and ω_g in (11). In our case however, the situation is even more complicated since we have no translation

invariance, and an exact computation of ω_g seems to be totally out of reach. Hence, we will have to rely on coarse approximations and mainly restrict our conclusions to simple situations.

Finally, let us state explicitly that although we use a statistical terminology, we do not want to say that the geometry is stochastic; all geometries are treated as equally real, although they contribute differently according to their weight.

4. SPACE-TIMES STATES.

Before we proceed to draw consequences from the Ensemble there is still one more concept that has to be borrowed from Statistical Mechanics, namely the idea of a Gibbs State.

So far we have only considered a bounded region Ω in space-time, where the metric has been given on $\partial\Omega$. We can now generalize this concept to arbitrary space-time manifolds. First observe that instead of considering the metric to be fixed on $\partial\Omega$, we might as well more generally assume that we are given any probability measure on the set of metrics on $\partial\Omega$, and then study the corresponding average ensemble in Ω .

Now assume that we are given two bounded regions Ω and Ω' in space-time with $\Omega \subset \Omega'$, and furthermore an ensemble measure $dP_{\Omega'}$ on Ω' . Then clearly $dP_{\Omega'}$ can be used to define a new ensemble measure dP_{Ω} on Ω by assigning to each (measurable) set U of geometries on Ω , the average measure with respect to $dP_{\Omega'}$ of all geometries in Ω' such that their restrictions to Ω belong to U . We shall say that dP_{Ω} is the Ensemble measure on Ω induced by $dP_{\Omega'}$.

Definition 1. A *Space-time state* W is a topological 4-manifold M with an ensemble measure dP_{Ω} for each bounded subset Ω such that whenever $\Omega \subset \Omega'$, dP_{Ω} is induced by $dP_{\Omega'}$ as above.

Clearly, every compact manifold-with-boundary Ω with an Ensemble measure dP_{Ω} will give rise to a space-time state by equipping every subset Ω' with the corresponding Ensemble measures induced by dP_{Ω} .

On the other hand, in the case of a non-compact manifold, we may attempt to construct space-time states by taking suitable limits of Ensemble measures on bounded subsets. This should be compared with the constructions of Gibbs measures in Statistical Mechanics. If we carry the construction out in this way, it is also natural to assume that each bounded subset will have (except for statistical fluctuations) a welldefined volume

For the rest of this paper, we shall assume that space-time is described by a certain space-time state, and try to use the Ensemble measures to draw consequences from this assumption.

5. APPROXIMATE CALCULATIONS WITH THE PARTITION FUNCTION.

We shall now attempt to compute Π_g approximately in some relatively simple cases. First, we concentrate on the case when $R = 0$. Let us denote by δg_{α}^{ij} a small variation of the ij -component of the metric tensor g_{α} in D_{α} . We now make the simplifying assumption that δg_{α}^{ij} is (almost) constant in D_{α} , vanishes outside D_{α} and otherwise behave as statistically independent variables (apart from the symmetry condition $\delta g_{\alpha}^{ij} = \delta g_{\alpha}^{ji}$). Just as in classical statistical mechanics, we expect a maximum on G_{Ω} to be very sharply peaked (μ being very large). One

can thus expect that only terms of low order in the expansion of R around the maximum point will play an essential role. Now it is well known that if

$$(12) \quad R_\Delta = \frac{1}{\Delta} \int_D R dV, \quad (\Delta = Vol(D)),$$

then

$$(13) \quad \delta(R_\Delta) = \frac{1}{\Delta} \int_D \left(R_{ij} - \frac{1}{2} g_{ij} R \right) \delta g^{ij} dV + \frac{1}{\Delta} \int_D g^{ij} (\delta \Gamma_{ij;k}^k - \delta \Gamma_{ik;j}^k) dV$$

where furthermore the second integral, by a covariant partial integration, can be shown to vanish when the support of δg^{ij} is contained in D . In our case, we therefore get for the first variation:

$$(14) \quad \delta(R_\Delta) = \frac{1}{\Delta} \int_D R_{ij} \delta g^{ij} dV \approx R_{g,ij} \delta g^{ij}.$$

Hence, in the case of vanishing Ricci tensor, the leading terms in the expansion of R_Δ is a second order expression in the δg_α^{ij} :s and consequently, the leading term in the expansion of R_Δ^2 is of order four. To compute this exactly is a complicated task, and we shall instead simply approximate with the corresponding second variation for flat space-time which we furthermore replace by a kind of average variation which behaves in the same way in all directions g^{ij} . This is obviously not realistic for a single domain D_α , but may still be very reasonable when we deal with many D_α :s simultaneously; statistically, the variations will be distributed more or less evenly over all directions.

If we denote the mean curvature in D_α by R_α , then we thus write approximately

$$(15) \quad (R_\alpha)^2 = c \|\delta g_\alpha\|^4 \quad \text{where} \quad \|\delta g_\alpha\| = (\delta g_\alpha^{ij} \delta g_{\alpha,ij})^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

If we now let U_g be some neighbourhood of g in G_Ω (large enough to contain essentially all variations that contribute to the maximum), it follows that

$$(16) \quad \Pi_g \approx \int_{U_g} \exp\{-\mu \int_\Omega R_\Delta^2 dV\} d\omega \approx \int_{\mathbf{R}^{10}} \int_{\mathbf{R}^{10}} \dots \int_{\mathbf{R}^{10}} \exp\{-\mu_\Delta \sum_{\alpha \in I} (R_\alpha)^2\} dG$$

where $dG = \prod_{\alpha \in I} d(\delta g)_\alpha$ with $d(\delta g)_\alpha = \prod_{i \leq j} d(\delta g_\alpha^{ij})$,

$$(17) \quad \approx \left(\int \exp\{-\mu_\Delta c \|\delta g_\alpha\|^4 d(\delta g)_\alpha\} \right)^N = \left(C(\mu_\Delta)^{-\frac{10}{4}} \right)^N.$$

Here, N is the number of sets D_α in the subdivision and C is the definite ten dimensional integral

$$(18) \quad C = (c)^{-\frac{10}{4}} \int_{\mathbf{R}^{10}} \exp\{-\|(\delta g)_\alpha\|^4\} d(\delta g)_\alpha.$$

If we note that (when Δ is fixed), the volume is proportional to N , then this can be written

$$(19) \quad \log \Pi_g = k \cdot Vol(\Omega).$$

Next, we turn to the case when $R = 0$ but the Ricci tensor does not vanish. In this case the first order variation δR_α in (14) obviously defines a linear functional on the space of perturbations δg_α of g_α :

$$(20) \quad L(\delta g_\alpha) = R_{\alpha,ij} \delta g_\alpha^{ij}$$

Clearly, in the direction $\hat{\eta}$ of maximal growth (i.e. when δg_α^{ij} is proportional to $R_{\alpha,ij}$), the first order terms dominate and higher order terms can be neglected (for large μ). On the other hand, in the (nine) directions orthogonal to $\hat{\eta}$, we assume that we can still estimate with the second order terms as above. Parallel to $\hat{\eta}$, we thus have that $|L(\delta g_\alpha)| = \|L\| \cdot \|\delta g_\alpha\|$ where $\|L\|$ denotes the mapping norm. On the other hand, it is readily seen that

$$(21) \quad \frac{1}{2}\|R\| \leq \|L\|.$$

Hence, we get (with $\delta g_\alpha = (\delta g'_\alpha, \delta g''_\alpha)$ where $\delta g'_\alpha \parallel \hat{\eta}$ and $\delta g''_\alpha \perp \hat{\eta}$):

$$(22) \quad (R_\alpha)^2 \geq \frac{1}{2}\|R_\alpha\|^2 \cdot \|\delta g'_\alpha\|^2 + c\|\delta g''_\alpha\|^4.$$

This estimate should clearly be used in the case when the second order terms really dominate the forth order terms on the interval where $\mu_\Delta R_\alpha^2$ differs significantly from 0, i.e. when

$$(23) \quad \|R_\alpha\| \gg \|\delta g_\alpha\| \approx \mu_\Delta^{-\frac{1}{4}}.$$

This leads to

$$(24) \quad \Pi_g \approx \int_{U_g} \exp\{-\mu \int_\Omega R_\Delta^2 dV\} d\omega \approx \int_{\mathbf{R}^{10}} \int_{\mathbf{R}^{10}} \dots \int_{\mathbf{R}^{10}} \exp\{-\mu_\Delta \sum_{\alpha \in I} (R_\alpha)^2\} dG$$

$$(25) \quad \leq \left(\int \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\mu_\Delta (\|R_\alpha\|^2 \cdot \|\delta g'_\alpha\|^2 + c\|\delta g''_\alpha\|^4) d(\delta g)_\alpha\right\} \right)^N = \\ = \prod_\alpha \left(C'(\mu_\Delta)^{-\frac{11}{4}} \|R_\alpha\|^{-1} \right)$$

where

$$(26) \quad C' = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} c^{-\frac{9}{4}} \int_{\mathbf{R}^{10}} \exp\{-\|\delta g'_\alpha\|^2 - \|\delta g''_\alpha\|^4\} d(\delta g)_\alpha.$$

Summarizing, we easily obtain:

Claim 1. *Suppose that the scalar curvature R of the metric g vanishes in the region $\Omega = \bigcup D_\alpha$. If the Ricci tensor R_{ij} vanishes in Ω , then*

$$\Pi_g \approx \left(C(\mu_\Delta)^{-\frac{10}{4}} \right)^N.$$

If, on the other hand, $\|R_g\| \geq \rho \gg \mu_\Delta^{-\frac{1}{4}}$ in Ω , then

$$\Pi_g \leq \left(C'(\mu_\Delta)^{-\frac{11}{4}} \rho^{-1} \right)^N,$$

where C and C' are both of the order ~ 1 .

In the case when $R \neq 0$, then the situation becomes much more complicated. However, in many cases of interest, it appears that R varies very slowly compared to the scale where the fluctuations of the metric become large. In this case, it seems reasonable to approximate the contribution to Π_g from these fluctuations with the corresponding fluctuations of flat space-time, at least if we do not demand to precise results. Thus in this case

$$(27) \quad \Pi_g \approx \int_{U_g} \exp\{-\mu \int_\Omega R_\Delta^2 dV\} d\omega \approx$$

$$\approx \exp\{-\mu \int_{\Omega} R_{\Delta}^2 dV\} \int_{U_g} \exp\{-\|\delta g\|^4\} dG = \exp\{-\mu \int_{\Omega} R_{\Delta}^2 dV\} K^N$$

as in (16-17) where N is essentially proportional to the volume of V ; hence we can write

$$(28) \quad \log \Pi_g \approx -\mu \int_{\Omega} R_g^2 dV + k \text{Vol}(\Omega).$$

Remark 3. We shall in the following assume that μ and c are such that the second volume-depending part of the exponent above is much larger than the first curvature integral in the situations that we will be discussing.

In spite of the above, we shall argue later in section 7 that a non-vanishing scalar curvature does have an important effect on the perturbation depending part of Π_g in the limit of very small curvature.

In fact, we have seen above that when $R = 0$ but $R_{ij} \neq 0$, then Π_g can be estimated as in (24-25). If we heuristically suppose that qualitatively the same kind of correction to ω_g is true in the case when R is small but R_{ij} is still large when compared to $\mu_{\Delta}^{-\frac{1}{4}}$ as above, then we get in this case (using (11))

$$(29) \quad \Pi_g \leq \left(C'(\mu_{\Delta})^{-\frac{11}{4}} \rho^{-1}\right) \exp\{-\mu \int_{\Omega} R_g^2 dV\}.$$

6. EINSTEIN'S FIELD EQUATIONS.

The General Theory of Relativity is, at least when the curvature is small, a very well confirmed theory. Hence, any theory aiming at an explanation of the concept of matter should include an explanation of Einstein's field equations. In this section we shall argue that in the limit of large volume and low curvature, the macroscopic states introduced in sections 3-4 that satisfy the vacuum equations (vanishing Ricci tensor) are much more probable than other states.

To this end, let us recall that due to the exponential factor in (11), states with nonvanishing scalar curvature tend to be very unlikely. Hence, if the boundary conditions admit metrics with $R = 0$ at all, then these are the natural candidates for the probability maximizing states. We shall therefore be content with comparing metrics with $R = 0$ and show that those with $R_{ij} = 0$ are much more probable.

Let us now consider some bounded subset Ω of space-time and suppose that we are given some boundary condition h for the metric on $\partial\Omega$. Suppose moreover that there is a metric g_0 on Ω with vanishing Ricci curvature, $R_{ij} = 0$, and let g be any other metric on Ω satisfying the same boundary condition. We assume that the scalar curvature of g is zero but for the norm of the Ricci tensor we have $\|R\| \geq \rho > 0$ at all points of Ω . Now choose a volume scale Δ so large that $\rho \gg \mu_{\Delta}^{-\frac{1}{4}}$. Then split Ω up into a disjoint union of N sets D_{α} with $\text{vol}(D_{\alpha}) \approx \Delta$. According to Claim 1, we have

$$(30) \quad \frac{\Pi_g}{\Pi_{g_0}} \leq \frac{\left(C'(\mu_{\Delta})^{-\frac{11}{4}} \rho^{-1}\right)^N}{\left(C(\mu_{\Delta})^{-\frac{10}{4}}\right)^N} \leq (\tau)^N$$

where $\tau < 1$ in view of the fact that $\rho \gg \mu_{\Delta}^{-\frac{1}{4}}$ and $C, C' \sim 1$. Hence we arrive at

Claim 2. *In the limit of large volume, i.e. when N is large, the metric g_0 is much more probable than g .*

We also note that the decay is exponential in N , i.e. the difference in probability will grow very fast when we increase the volume.

If we now restrict our attention to the situation where the space-time state is time-independent, rotation symmetric and asymptotically flat, then it follows that far away from the origin, Einstein's field equations must be satisfied and therefore the geometry is given by the Schwarzschild metric:

$$(31) \quad ds^2 = -\left(1 - \frac{2M}{r}\right)dt^2 + \left(1 - \frac{2M}{r}\right)^{-1}dr^2 + r^2 d\phi^2 + r^2 \sin^2 \phi d\theta^2.$$

It is however interesting to note that this also follows in a more direct way from the following

Principle 1 (of Geometric Pressure.). *Suppose that W is a space-time state and let dP be the corresponding ensemble measure on some bounded subset Ω with some fixed volume. Then for all (macroscopic) subsets $\Omega_1, \Omega_2 \subset \Omega$,*

$$(32) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial V_1} \log \Pi_1 = \frac{\partial}{\partial V_2} \log \Pi_2$$

where Π_1 and Π_2 are the partition sums of Ω_1 and Ω_2 computed for all metrics under the constraints $Vol(\Omega_1) = V_1$ and $Vol(\Omega_2) = V_2$.

In fact, space-time states are in a formal sense very much like equilibrium states in classical statistical mechanics, and the usual argument there works just as well here; assuming the above derivatives not to be equal, we can easily construct a more probable state by transferring an infinitesimal amount of volume from one region to the other.

We shall now apply the pressure principle to cylindrical regions around a particle. Since these cylinders are unbounded, we have to consider all entities *per unit time* (/ut) meaning the free space time far away from the origin. We note that it follows from the pressure principle that

$$(33) \quad P = \frac{\delta}{\delta s}(\log \Pi) = k \cdot A$$

where δs denotes the change in radial *distance* and the constant k is the same as in [???]. We note that for the Schwarzschild metric, s is not the same as r , although they approach each other asymptotically.

Clearly a rotation symmetric metric can be written as

$$(34) \quad g = ds^2 = -(1 - a(r))dt^2 + (1 - b(r))^{-1}dr^2 + r^2 d\phi^2 + r^2 \sin^2 \phi d\theta^2.$$

We now make the reasonable assumption that the effect of the presence of a topological particle on the geometry for large r is very small, which means that the metric there should be very close to the flat one. Also, the volume (/ut) of the spherical shell between radii r and $r' = r + \Delta r$ (r large) should be very close to the Euclidian value. Hence, it then follows that, $a(r) \approx b(r)$ since the deviation of the volume of the shell (/ut) from $4\pi r^2 \Delta r$ is $\approx 4\pi(a(r) - b(r))r^2 \Delta r$.

According to the above formula for the metric, the area (/ut) of the cylinder with radius r is $4\pi r^2 \sqrt{1 - a(r)}$. Hence, expanding at r we obtain for the area A' at radius $r' = r + \Delta r$ (to first order in Δr and $\Delta a(r)$)

$$(35) \quad A' = 4\pi(r')^2 \sqrt{1 - a(r')} = 4\pi r^2 \sqrt{1 - a(r)} + 8\pi r \Delta r - 2\pi r^2 \Delta a(r) \dots$$

On the other hand, we can also compute A' using the pressure principle as

$$(36) \quad A' = \frac{1}{k} P' = \frac{1}{k} \frac{\delta(\log \Pi')}{\delta s'}.$$

The change in $\log \Pi'$ when the radial distance is changed by $\delta s'$ can for large r heuristically be computed as follows. We first note that

$$(37) \quad \delta(\log \Pi') = \delta(\log \Pi'') + \delta(\log \Pi)$$

where Π'' is the partition function of the shell region Ω'' of points with radial coordinate between r and r' , and Π is the partition function of the cylindrical region with radial coordinate less than r . To compute the change in the two terms on the righthand side separately, we must know how much each of the corresponding regions is expanded. At low curvature, it is reasonable to assume that the expansion is homogeneously distributed over Ω to first order; it follows that (again to first order) r is changed by the amount $\delta s = r \delta s' / r'$

To compute the change in logarithm of this partition sum of the shell region, we use the fact that the geometry there is very close to the flat one; a small volume element is therefore changed by the factor $(1 + 3\delta s')/r'$ when r' is changed by $\delta s'$, just as in flat space. Hence, the change in $\log \Pi''$ can be computed to first order as

$$(38) \quad \delta(\log \Pi'') \approx 3\delta s' / r' \cdot k \cdot 4\pi r^2 \Delta r = 12k\pi r \Delta r \delta s'.$$

On the other hand, to compute $\delta(\log \Pi)$ we simply use the definition of P in (33):

$$(39) \quad \begin{aligned} \delta(\log \Pi) &= P \cdot \delta s = 4k\pi r^2 \sqrt{1 - a(r)} \cdot r \delta s' / r' = \\ &= 4k\pi r^2 \sqrt{1 - a(r)} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\Delta r}{r}\right) \delta s' \approx \left(4\pi r^2 \sqrt{1 - a(r)} - 4\pi r \Delta r + 2\pi r a(r) \Delta r\right) \delta s'. \end{aligned}$$

Adding the expressions for $\delta(\log \Pi'')$ and $\delta(\log \Pi)$, it follows that

$$(40) \quad A' = 4\pi r^2 \sqrt{1 - a(r)} + 8\pi r \Delta r + 2\pi r a(r) \Delta r \dots$$

If we now compare the two expressions for A' to first order, we obtain

$$(41) \quad -\Delta a(r) = \frac{a(r)}{r} \Delta r$$

which is readily integrated to give

$$(42) \quad a(r) (= b(r)) = \frac{2M}{r}$$

For some constant M , which implies (31).

7. TOPOLOGICAL PARTICLES.

In this section, we shall consider the simplest possible topological model for elementary particles, namely as topological obstructions to ordinary flat 3-dimensional geometry (in the following simply called topological particles). The idea is very old and in fact it may even be said to be older than quantum mechanics itself (see [1]). This is a very natural and attractive approach since it makes the otherwise so mysterious concept of matter redundant. Moreover, once we give up the concept of a universal flat space-time, as we are forced to by general relativity, there is really no good reason at all to assume the topology to be trivial. However, the problem seems to be that this simple idea has not been able to explain very much. It could even be said that it creates more problems than it solves; for instance, Einsteins field equations are obviously insufficient to describe the behaviour of space-time at the

micro-level, so what should replace them? It is well-known that various worm-holes in space-time are unstable within the framework of general relativity, and cannot be made stable without additional somewhat unnatural extra assumptions.

Even more seriously, if space-time is to be viewed as the only ingredient out of which the world is built up, then we will have great difficulties in explaining the various properties of elementary particles like the size of their masses, spin, strong, weak and electromagnetic interactions, and other related properties. In fact, since there would be nothing which could distinguish particles from empty space except the topology, we would be left with very few "handles" for attaching other features. Hence, attention has in the last decades been focused on other theories, based on more complicated ideas, i.e. various gauge and string theories.

In the following, we shall argue that the topological view of particles together with the Ensemble assumption that we have made can be used to explain at least some of the basic properties that particles should have.

Hence, suppose that we attach to ordinary three-dimensional space, some topological obstruction near the origin, thus forming a new topological manifold. We then extend homogeneously in the time-direction, and arrive at a representation of a topological particle at rest. We now introduce the corresponding space-time state with "free boundary conditions", e.g. we consider large "cylinder-shaped" sets of the form $Z_{T,R} = I_T \times B_R$ where B_R is a sphere of radius R and I_T is an interval $[-T, T]$, and assume as boundary condition for the metric on $I_T \times \partial B_R$, the usual flat Minkowski-metric. It is now reasonable to expect that if we let $T, R \rightarrow \infty$ in such a way that $R \ll T$, then the corresponding Ensemble measures $dP_{T,R}$ will converge to form a space-time state W on M , essentially independently of how we specify the boundary conditions on the ends of the cylinders, and moreover, this state should be time independent in an obvious sense. It also seems reasonable to assume that this metric is, at least far away from the obstruction itself, close to the flat one and rotation symmetric.

In certain situations when we neglect gravitational effects, we will adopt the following somewhat simplified model: Let us suppose that outside the cylinder $Z = B_R \times \mathbf{R}$, the metric is flat. Inside Z on the other hand, we have some topological particle, and we suppose that the metric tensor is of the form

$$(43) \quad g = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & * & * & * \\ 0 & * & * & * \\ 0 & * & * & * \end{pmatrix}.$$

We hence simply consider the time-scale to uniformly the same at all points. This is obviously not a realistic assumption but may still give a qualitatively correct picture of some phenomena. In view of the pressure principle of section 6, we will also assume that the four-volume inside Z is the same as in flat space-time; in fact, the pressure exerted on Z from the interior is by the arguing of the previous section proportional to the volume inside. Hence, at equilibrium the volume within Z must be equal to the volume inside a similar cylinder in flat space-time.

As a particular example (which will be used later in section 10) consider two spheres of radius 1 in Euclidean three-space with centers at the points $P_+ = (R, 0, 0)$ and $P_- = (-R, 0, 0)$. We now delete the interiors of these two spheres and instead we glue on to the remaining borders, a cylindrical set $A = [-a, a] \times S^2$, described by a coordinate $\rho \in [-a, a]$ and spherical coordinates ϕ, θ on S^2 . This is done in

such a way that the top ($\rho = a$) and bottom ($\rho = -a$) glue on to the spheres around P_+ and P_- respectively in a natural way, and so that on the borders, ϕ measures angles in the xy -plane and θ measures angles from the positive z -axis. If we now take the Cartesian product of the resulting manifold M with R (the time direction), we get a very simple model of a topological particle at rest. We will not try to compute the probability maximizing metric at the present stage of the investigation. However, for heuristic reasoning, we can use the following metric:

(44)

$$g = -dt^2 + d\rho^2 + \left(\frac{1 + (\rho/a)^2}{2}\right)^2 d\theta^2 + \left(\frac{1 + (\rho/a)^2}{2}\right)^2 \sin^2 \theta d\phi^2, \quad -a \leq \rho \leq a.$$

The choice of the metric may be somewhat arbitrary but it still has the property that its first derivatives fit continuously onto the usual space-time metric of the surrounding Minkowski-space (in spherical coordinates around P_+ and P_-):

$$(45) \quad ds^2 = -dt^2 + dr^2 + r^2 d\theta^2 + r^2 \sin^2 \theta d\phi^2 \quad r \geq 1.$$

This is to prohibit contributions from the borders of the cylinder to influence the total Curvature. The choice of a is not fixed; if we want a simple model for computation, we may simply choose $a = 1$. On the other hand, if we insist that the space-time volume (/ut) inside some cylinder Z containing the particle should equal its corresponding free space-time value, the the correct value turns out to be $a = 5/7$.

The main problem with this kind of worm-hole in general relativity is that it will very rapidly contract and then disappear through a singularity. As has already been noted however, this kind of singular behaviour is very unlikely to occur in our context, because large scalar curvature or Ricci tensor will make the partition sum of the corresponding macro-metric very small. We will now extend this discussion and argue that a topological particle as above is stable and also has a fixed size. Again, any kind of rigorous proof is out of reach and we will have to be content with the following heuristic reasoning.

Consider therefore a topological particle contained in some Z as above. We suppose without proof that such a particle must have Ricci tensor $R_g \neq 0$ at least a some point and translate this into a mathematically somewhat more easily treatable statement by assuming that $\|R_g\| \geq \rho \gg \mu_\Delta^{-\frac{1}{4}}$

We can now consider dilatations g_λ of g simply by multiplying the spatial part by λ . Now, let Z' be a another cylinder with radius equal to R (in the case $\lambda \rightarrow 0$) or $\lambda^2 R$ (in the case $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$). Moreover, denote by Π_g and Π_{g_λ} the partition sums corresponding to the metrics g and g_λ in Z' .

Claim 3. *In the limits when $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ or 0,*

$$\frac{\Pi_{g_\lambda}}{\Pi_g} \rightarrow 0.$$

We conclude that there must a $\lambda \in]0, \infty[$ which maximizes the probability.

To prove the claim, we first note that when $\lambda \rightarrow 0$, then

$$(46) \quad \int R_{g_\lambda}^2 dV \propto \frac{1}{\lambda}$$

since $R_{g_\lambda} \propto 1/\lambda^2$ and $dV_\lambda \propto \lambda^3$. Hence, in this case the numerator in the claim will decrease very rapidly in view of (29), which implies half of the claim.

On the other hand, when $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$(47) \quad \frac{\Pi_{g\lambda}}{\Pi_g} = \frac{\Pi_{g\lambda}}{\Pi_0} \cdot \frac{\Pi_0}{\Pi_g}$$

where Π_0 is the free space partition function corresponding to the same volume (/ut) as Z' . The second factor is just a number independent of λ . Hence for some constants k, K we further get

$$(48) \quad \leq K \frac{\left(C'(\mu_\Delta)^{-\frac{11}{4}} \rho^{-1}\right)^N \exp\{-\frac{1}{\lambda} \mu \int_\Omega R_g^2 dV\}}{\left(C(\mu_\Delta)^{-\frac{10}{4}}\right)^N} \leq K \tau^N \exp\{-\frac{k}{\lambda}\}$$

where N as before is the number of D_α :s in a partion of Z' . When $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$, clearly $N \rightarrow \infty$ as well, and $\tau < 1$ just as in (30). The other part of the Claim follows.

Remark 4. This statement as it stands is not literally true in the limit $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$. In fact, when the Ricci tensor becomes so small that it becomes comparable to $\mu_\Delta^{-\frac{1}{4}}$, then the estimate in (48) can no longer be used.

8. GRAVITATIONAL MASS.

It follows from the arguments in the previous sections that the geometry around a topological particle must be given by the Schwarzschild metric, at least at large distance from the obstruction itself. This obviously gives a possibility to identify the mass of a topological particle with the constant M in (31). However, this definition is somewhat unsatisfactory from the point of view of understanding; a complete theory based on the principles of section 2 should express mass only in terms of geometric properties like curvature. This, as it seems however, is mathematically a far more difficult task and we shall therefore at this point be content by heuristically discussing what the relationship should be like.

Remark 5. The mass introduced above is clearly a kind of gravitational mass. However, it does not seem to be obvious that this mass is the same as the gravitational mass that one measures with scales. Hence, if we want to distinguish the two types of gravitational mass, we shall call the mass introduced above *the Schwarzschild mass* of the particle. We will return to this question in section 11.

In the previous section, we presented a simplified model of a topological particle at rest, where it was assumed that space-time was flat outside of a certain radius r_0 and inside of r_0 the metric was taken to satisfy (43). Clearly, the former assumption has to be modified if we want to study the gravitational mass. Hence, we will admit the metric far away to be given by the Scharzschild metric as in (31), and we will also assume that this correction to the flat metric can be treated as small. When we get closer to r_0 the metric has to be modified in order to fit on to the uniform-time metric inside. Hence we write for $r \geq r_0$,

$$(49) \quad g = ds^2 = -(1 - a_M(r))dt^2 + (1 - a_M(r))^{-1}dr^2 + r^2 d\phi^2 + r^2 \sin^2 \phi d\theta^2,$$

where

$$(50) \quad a_M(r) \sim \frac{2M}{r}$$

asymptotically. We shall also assume that in this region, the behavior of g is more or less independent of the detailed structure of the particle. As is commonly done

in contemporary physics, this will be interpreted as a scale invariance property in the following sense:

$$(51) \quad a_M(r) = M^\beta a\left(\frac{r}{M^\alpha}\right).$$

We note as in section 6 that due to the exponential factor in (11), macro-metrics with vanishing scalar curvature are much more likely than others, hence we also demand $R_g = 0$ outside the cylinder $r \leq r_0$.

Finally, we observe that both from a physical and mathematical point of view, it is natural to suppose that in the presence of several particles that interact only weakly with each other, the total mass should approximately be the sum of the individual masses, at least as long as the number of particles is small. In fact, small corrections to the free space solution of Einstein's field equations essentially add.

These assumptions are obviously approximations, but it can still be hoped that they will give a qualitatively correct picture.

With this in mind, we shall now try to determine the form of the function $a(r)$ and to compute the value of M . To do so, we shall maximize the approximate expression (28) for the partition function Π_g .

Claim 4. *Under the above assumptions, the function $a_M (= b_M)$ must be of the form*

$$a(r) = \frac{2M}{r} - \frac{Mr_0}{r^2}.$$

To see this, first note that computing the scalar curvature of the metric (49) gives, after some work

$$(52) \quad R_g = a_M''(r) + 4\frac{a_M'(r)}{r} + 2\frac{a_M(r)}{r^2}.$$

Thus, the condition $R_g = 0$ is a second order differential equation for $a(r)$ which is easily seen to have the general solution

$$(53) \quad a_M(r) = \frac{C_1}{r} + \frac{C_2}{r^2}.$$

From the asymptotic behavior, we immediately conclude that $C_1 = 2M$. Moreover, if we want $a(r)$ to fit smoothly onto the uniform time for $r \leq r_0$, then clearly we must have $a_M'(r_0) = 0$ which gives $C_2 = -Mr_0$ and $a_M(r_0) = M/r_0$, hence the claim follows.

Next, we turn to the problem of computing the partition function of the particle. To make the arguments less dependent of the specific shape of the region Ω , it is often more practical to consider the deviation of the logarithm of partition function from the corresponding free space value. Since this deviation plays a fundamental role in the following, we shall introduce a special symbol for it:

Definition 2. Suppose that some topological particle P moves along a world-line through some region Ω of space-time. We denote by Ξ_P the difference

$$\Xi_P = \log \Pi - \log \Pi_P$$

where Π_P is the partition function of the particle and Π is the corresponding partition function of free space. In a similar way, one can define Ξ for any collection of particles passing through Ω .

Claim 5. *Under the assumptions above, Ξ_P (/ut) for a particle with curvature integral*

$$I = \int R_g^2 dV \quad (/ut),$$

and the geometry outside Z defined by a_M as in claim 4, is given by

$$\Xi_P = \mu \cdot I - k_1 \cdot I \cdot M^\beta + k_2 \cdot M^{1+2\alpha}.$$

where k_1 and k_2 are constants which are independent of the particular particle and M .

In fact, if we compare with (28), we can conclude that the correction of $\log \Pi - \log \Pi_P$ to $\mu \cdot I$ (corresponding to the case $M = 0$), splits into two parts; the change in the curvature integral (ΔI) and the change in the space-time volume (ΔV). To compute ΔI (/ut) as a function of M , we first note that the geometry itself inside of Z is not effected at all by a change in M . Hence, the only contribution to ΔI comes from the fact that the time scale within Z according to (49) and (51) is contracted by a factor $\sqrt{1 - a_M} \approx 1 - M^\beta/2$. It follows that

$$(54) \quad \Delta I = \frac{1}{2} M^\beta I.$$

On the other hand, to compute ΔV we shall use the Principle of geometric pressure in section 6. In fact, since pressure on a cylinder is proportional to its height, it follows that the pressure exerted on Z (/ut) should be multiplied, as compared to the pressure on a corresponding cylinder in free space, by the same factor $\sqrt{1 - a_M} = \sqrt{1 - a_M(r_0)} = \sqrt{1 - M/r_0} \approx 1 - M/2r_0$. However, it follows from (51) that $r_0/M^\alpha = c$ or $r_0 = cM^\alpha$ for some constant c depending only on $a(r)$. Hence, we get

$$(55) \quad \Delta V = \frac{4\pi}{3} r_0^3 \cdot \frac{M}{r_0} = K \cdot M^{1+2\alpha}$$

which implies the claim with $k_1 = \mu/2$ and $k_2 = K/2$.

Claim 6. *In the approximate model we are considering, we have*

$$a_M(r) (= b_M(r)) = K_1 \cdot \frac{I}{r} - K_2 \cdot \frac{r_0 I^{4/3}}{r^2} \quad \text{when} \quad r \geq r_0$$

where K_1 and K_2 are constants, independent of the structure of the particle. In particular, for large r ,

$$a_M(r) (= b_M(r)) \sim \frac{K_1 \cdot I}{r} = \text{const} \frac{\int_Q R_g^2 dV}{r}.$$

We can therefore identify the curvature integral with the Schwarzschild mass of the particle:

$$M_g = \int_Q R_g^2 dV.$$

In fact, the most probable state will minimize Ξ_P with respect to M . Hence

$$(56) \quad \frac{\partial \Xi_P}{\partial M} = -\beta k_1 M^{\beta-1} \cdot I + k_2(1 + 2\alpha)M^{2\alpha} = 0$$

or

$$(57) \quad M^{2\alpha+1-\beta} = \text{const} \cdot I.$$

Since we have insisted that M should behave additively in the case of weakly interacting particles, we have no choice (since I behaves additively) but to set $2\alpha + 1 - \beta = 1$. This, together with the condition $\alpha + \beta = 1$ which follows from (50), gives $\alpha = 1/3$, $\beta = 2/3$ and finally, combining with claim 4,

$$(58) \quad a_M(r) = \frac{K_1 I}{r} - \frac{r_0 K_2 I^{4/3}}{r^2} \quad \text{when} \quad r \geq r_0.$$

Neglecting the second term at large distance we now get the claim.

Clearly, the derivation has been based on very crude and heuristic reasoning. There is really no good reason to claim this identification to be exact, but one can still have hopes that it gives a correct picture to a first degree of approximation.

Remark 6. It also follows from claim 5 and the proof of claim 6 that the Ξ -function in definition 2 of the particle can be written

$$(59) \quad \Xi_P = \tau M_g T + \tau^* M_g^{\frac{5}{3}} T$$

where T denotes the time (in the rest-frame of the particle) needed to cross Ω , and τ and τ^* are constants independent of the particular properties of the particle. If the parameters of our model are chosen as in remark 3, then it can be seen that M_g becomes very small as it should in order to represent the gravitational influence of a single particle. In this case we can therefore neglect the second term (to a high degree of accuracy) and hence write

$$(60) \quad \Xi_P = \tau M_g T$$

We can also express the idea of a probability maximizing state using Ξ :

Principle 2. *The probability maximizing states are the ones that minimizes Ξ*

Principle 3. *Suppose that we have a one-parameter family of macro-metrics g_s . If the metric g_0 is probability maximizing, then*

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial s} \Xi(s) = 0.$$

9. INERTIAL MASS.

In claim 6 of the previous section, we derived the following heuristic formula for the (Schwarzschild-) gravitational mass of a free topological particle:

$$(61) \quad M = \int_V R_\Delta^2 dV.$$

In this section, we will argue that the above defined M also can be identified (approximately) with the inertial mass of a topological particle, which offers a kind of explanation to the supposed equivalence between these two concept. In particular, the usual formula

$$(62) \quad E = \sum \frac{M_i}{\sqrt{1 - v_i^2}}$$

for the relativistic energy of a particle gives a conserved quantity. We shall be content with considering the case of a space-time which is essentially flat (except in the immediate vicinity of the particles), hence neglecting all gravitational effects.

To this end, let us consider n topological particles in four-dimensional Minkowsky space. We shall in the following argument, when computing their energies, use the

very reasonable approximation to treat them as point particles. On the other hand, when computing the most likely world-paths of the particles, we shall use the formulas above to maximize Ξ . Hence, suppose that in some suitable frame of reference, the positions of the particles at time t are given by 3-vectors $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n$. Slightly later, at time t' , the positions of the particles are given by $x'_1, x'_2, \dots, x'_n$. If we suppose that the difference $t' - t$ is so small that the motions during this time may be considered linear, then according to (6), the total Ξ -function of the system between t and t' is

$$(63) \quad \Xi_1 = \Xi(t, t', x, x') = \kappa \sum_{i=1}^n M_i T_i$$

where T_i denotes the proper time of the particle, elapsed during the passage from (t, x_i) to (t', x'_i) . Due to Lorentz invariance we obviously have $T_i^2 = (t'_i - t_i)^2 - |x'_i - x_i|^2$, which gives

$$(64) \quad \Xi_1 = \Xi(t, t', x, x') = \kappa \sum_{i=1}^n M_i \sqrt{(t'_i - t_i)^2 - |x'_i - x_i|^2}.$$

Next, consider another short time interval $[t'', t''']$ with corresponding Ξ -function $\Xi_2 = \Xi(t'', t''', x'', x''')$. Clearly, the transformation which shrinks the interval $[t, t']$ into $[t + \Delta t, t']$ and simultaneously dilates $[t'', t''']$ into $[t'', t''' + \Delta t]$ is volume preserving, hence for the maximizing macro-state we get according to Principle 3 for the first variation:

$$(65) \quad 0 = \frac{\partial}{\partial t}(\Xi_1 + \Xi_2) = \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \Xi(t, t', x, x') + \frac{\partial}{\partial t''} \Xi(t'', t''', x'', x''') \right]$$

which leads to the conservation law

$$(66) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \Xi(t, t', x, x') = \text{const.}$$

A trivial computation now finally gives

$$(67) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \Xi(t, t', x, x') = -\kappa \sum_{i=1}^n M_i \frac{t'_i - t_i}{\sqrt{(t'_i - t_i)^2 - |x'_i - x_i|^2}} = -\kappa \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{M_i}{\sqrt{1 - u_i^2}}$$

where

$$(68) \quad u_i = \frac{|x'_i - x_i|}{t'_i - t_i}$$

is the velocity of the i :th particle. Combining the above statements we finally see that

$$(69) \quad E = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{M_i}{\sqrt{1 - u_i^2}}$$

is conserved. Let us finally note that although the above argument is a rather coarse one, it does not demand anything at all about the behavior of the particles between the moments of measurement; the particles may meet, mingle, interact so as to form new particles, and also change in number without effecting the conservation of E .

10. SPIN.

In the previous sections, we have discussed the concept of mass of a topological particle. It now turns out that this definition has very interesting consequences in connection with the rotation properties of such particles. In fact, it seems to be an unexpected feature of the Lorentz geometry that rotating particles may exhibit lower mass than non-rotating ones. This could open up a possible path for explaining spin properties of elementary particles; rotating states could be viewed as stable groundstates in very much the same way as the stability of for example the s-orbital state of the hydrogen atom is explained by the fact that its energy is the lowest available one. Of course, there may still be a substantial gap to the full spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ -structure used in particle physics.

Hence, let us return to the simple wormhole model introduced in section 7, and investigate what happens when we start to rotate it. Needless to say, there is no reason to expect the metric in (44) to be probability maximizing. Thus, from a strict mathematical point of view this example can not be claimed to prove anything about actual space-time states. Still it very clearly illustrates the difference between Lorentz and Euclidean geometry. For simplicity we will here work with the case $a = 1$ in (44) and write $r = \rho$. This is only to keep the formulas as simple as possible, and the reader may check that the same conclusion holds in the case $a = 5/7$.

As a further simplifying assumption we shall suppose that R is comparatively large so that, at the moment of observation, we can consider the hole around P_+ to be moving uniformly upwards (in the direction of the z -axis) with velocity v and the other hole around P_- correspondingly downwards. Let as usual, t, x, y, z denote coordinates with respect to the rest frame and let t', x', y', z' denote coordinates that move along with the hole around P_+ . Since the rotation is slow, we shall use the non-relativistic Galileo transform to connect these frames.

$$(70) \quad \begin{cases} t' &= t \\ x' &= x \\ y' &= y \\ z' &= -vt + z \end{cases}$$

In fact, our goal is only to construct *some* rotating metric which decreases Ξ , and from this point of view, any way of constructing it, invariant or not, is as good as another. Differentiating (70) and substituting in the flat metric gives

$$(71) \quad -dt^2 + dx^2 + dy^2 + dz^2 = -(1 - v^2)dt'^2 + dx'^2 + dy'^2 + dz'^2 - vdt'dz' - vdz'dt'.$$

From the geometry of the situation we see that $dz' = \cos\theta dr - r \sin\theta d\theta$ where we have used spherical coordinates as in section 7. On the other hand, a standard computation gives

$$(72) \quad dx'^2 + dy'^2 + dz'^2 = dr^2 + r^2 d\theta^2 + r^2 \sin^2\theta d\phi^2,$$

hence, substituting we arrive at the following boundary condition for $r = 1$ for the metric on the cylinder:

$$(73) \quad \begin{aligned} g_+ &= -(1 - v^2)dt^2 + dr^2 + r^2 d\theta^2 + r^2 \sin^2\theta d\phi^2 + \\ &\quad - v \cos\theta dt dr - v \cos\theta dr dt + vr \sin\theta dt d\theta + vr \sin\theta d\theta dt. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, on the boundary $r = -1$ the same reasoning is true except that we should replace v and r by $-v$ and $-r$, and also not that in this case $dz' = -\cos\theta dr + r \sin\theta d\theta$. Hence we get:

$$(74) \quad \begin{aligned} g_- = & -(1 - v^2)dt^2 + dr^2 + r^2 d\theta^2 + r^2 \sin^2\theta d\phi^2 + \\ & - v \cos\theta dt dr - v \cos\theta dr dt + vr \sin\theta dt d\theta + vr \sin\theta d\theta dt. \end{aligned}$$

If we now simply interpolate linearly between these two metrics, we get the following expression which furthermore coincides with the the given stationary metric for $v = 0$:

$$(75) \quad \begin{aligned} g = & -(1 - v^2)dt^2 + dr^2 + \left(\frac{1 + r^2}{2}\right)^2 d\theta^2 + \left(\frac{1 + r^2}{2}\right)^2 \sin^2\theta d\phi^2 \\ & - v \cos\theta dt dr - v \cos\theta dr dt + vr \sin\theta dt d\theta + vr \sin\theta d\theta dt. \end{aligned}$$

Now, in order to compute Ξ , we need also know how the change in the metric effects the volume element; in fact, the simple rotating model above has the small defect of slightly changing the volume from its value at $v = 0$. This defect could be overcome by minor modifications in (44) above, but only at the price of much more complex and ugly expressions.

Hence, we make at this point an approximation by using the non-rotating volume element

$$(76) \quad dV = \left(\frac{r^2 + 1}{2}\right)^2 \sin\theta dt dr d\theta d\phi.$$

Hence, a change in v will so to speak by definition be volume preserving, and although this gives a small error in the results below, it will not obscure the difference between Lorentzian and Euclidean geometry.

To compute

$$(77) \quad \int R^2 dV$$

of the metric g is a very laborious task, in fact more or less impossible to carry out by hand. However, if we use Taylor expansions in v and apply the built in tensor calculus of Maple V, we easily arrive at the the following expression for the Ξ -function per unit time:

$$(78) \quad \Xi = 57.820 - 65.485v^2 + 53.735v^4 \dots$$

Hence, we see that the Ξ -function initially decreases as v increases, suggesting that rotating particles may tend to be more stable than non-rotating ones. The result may seem quite counterintuitive and depends entirely on the peculiar properties of the Lorentz metric: In fact, if we make the same construction starting out from the usual Euclidean metric $ds^2 = dt^2 + dx^2 + dy^2 + dz^2$, Maple V gives

$$(79) \quad \Xi_{Euclidean} = 57.820 + 65.485v^2 + 184.71v^4 \dots$$

indicating that in this context, non-rotating particles actually minimize the Curvergy as one would expect.

11. CONCLUSIONS.

In this paper we have tried to sketch a simple geometric theory that could open up the way for a deeper understanding of the concept of matter. The point has not been to argue in favor of (or against for that part) any of the current wonderful theories of everything; clearly, any attempt to go further must necessarily include other old or new ideas. But since the focus here is on properties that are usually more or less taken for granted, it may be worth while to consider what consequences our approach might have for such bolder attempts.

Undeniably, the general theory of relativity is very basic to this paper: in the preassumptions (Postulate 1), in spirit (Postulate 3) and in the macroscopic aspects that emerge, at least for low curvature. Also, we have heuristically arrived at a kind of equivalence between gravitational and inertial mass which was really Einstein's starting point. However, let us emphasize that the discussion about the different types of mass here differs somewhat from the usual one in general relativity; there is no reason not to expect particles to follow geodesics or infinitesimal elevator passengers to be able to feel the difference between gravitation and acceleration. In this sense the equivalence principle is really built into the prerequisites of the theory. In our situation, the (Schwarzschild-) gravitational mass that we use is rather a measure of the effect that matter has on the space-time geometry itself. Of course, common physical sense usually takes for granted that the two concepts are identical, but in the approximate model discussed in sections 7 and 8, there seems to be a very small but significant difference between the two masses due to the extra term in the expression for Ξ_P in remark 6: heavy particles seem to have a slightly higher ratio M_i/M_g than light ones. It is not clear at this point if this is a consequence of the approximations we have made or if it really reflects an inherent property of the approach. It is possible that a more thorough study could show that the two masses are equal, but it could also reveal that the ratio between the two types of mass differs more substantially between different topological particles.

Also, since the metric of our theory by necessity will be very unlike the Schwarzschild metric at short distances, one can expect a more complete theory based on similar assumptions to give a different picture of events that involve high curvature.

In the treatment of the Ensemble in section 3, we have supposed that all metrics are allowed, but that the topological structure of the underlying manifold is fixed. This seems to be an adequate framework for the problems we have considered, but does not appear to be sufficient for describing other purely quantum mechanical situations (e.g. a particle passing simultaneously through two slits and afterwards interfering with itself). But there is really no good reason to restrict ourselves in this respect; in the definition of the Ensemble and the subsequent definition of space-time state, we can equally well allow all topological structures in the interior that are compatible with the boundary conditions. This however, leads to much more complicated definitions and calculations and also to still more difficult convergence problems for the partition functions, since now also the number of topological structures will be involved. Hence, we have chosen not to go further in this direction.

It should also be noted that there is in this theory no assumption about any kind of interaction between the different metrics, i.e. between different histories of a particle. In this sense, it is much closer to classical statistical mechanics than to the probabilistic reasoning within quantum mechanics which involves the use of

the complex phase of the wave function. It is interesting to note that some typical quantum phenomena, like spin, seem to be inherent in the picture anyway, but this does not imply that the same should hold true for other properties.

12. REFERENCES.

- [1] MISNER, C. W. & THORNE, K. S. & WHEELER, J. A., *Gravitation*.
W. H. Freeman and Company, San Fransisco, 1973.

Martin Tamm
Dept of Mathematics,
Univ. of Stockholm,
S-106 91 Stockholm,
Sweden.
matamm@matematik.su.se